letter read above was that there should not be two records—one in English by the Judge and another in Kannada by the Clerk. That kind of a duplication of work might be done away with and the presiding officers directed to record evidence in only one language, that language being prescribed as Kannada.

The PRESIDENT enquired whether it was the intention of the member that the recording of evidence by the clerk should be altogether eliminated.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR replied in the affirmative.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI observed that such a course could be thought of later on if and when all education was imparted in Kannada.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, however, thought that it was not necessary to put off this important reform. He requested the Government to make a reference to the High Court stating that as almost all the officers of the department were conversant with the Kannada language and the Assembly had in one voice demanded that the depositions in the courts should be recorded in Kannada by the presiding officers, the question might be once again examined by them.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI pointed out that at present suitable equivalents could not be found in Kannada for all the terms and phrases commonly employed in the transaction of judicial business.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR replied that that difficulty would be overcome within a short time by coining, if necessary, suitable terms and phrases in Kannada and that in that connection the Kannada Academy might be invited to give the necessary help.

The PRESIDENT was, however, of the opinion that even then it would not be feasible to eliminate English altogether, as it was never doubted that English played a most prominent and useful part in the disposal of all official business including judicial.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that while it might be necessary to employ English for inter-provincial or international correspondence, it was not so in the case of business transacted within the State.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI observed that in addition to the points he had already mentioned he would also say that another difficulty in the way of adopting Kannada for recording evidence in courts was that different languages were spoken in different parts of the State such as Telugu, Tamil or Hindustani, and if the claim on behalf of one language was conceded, the claims on behalf of all the others would also become entitled to equal recognition—a suggestion which, if accepted, would be found to be impracticable.

At 5-20 p.m., the House rose for the day to meet again at 12 of the clock on Monday, 3rd October 1938.

FIFTH DAY.

Monday, 3rd October 1938.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion, on Monday, 3rd October 1938, at 12 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Selection of Revenue Probationers.

Q.—23. **Mr. H. P. BASAPPA** (Heggaddevankote Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the communities to which the Revenue Probationers, except Mr. Kasna Naik, selected by Government, belong ;